

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

ONEAL CRENSHAW,

Defendant-Petitioner,

V.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Respondent.

Case No. 1:10-CV-00047
1:06-CR-00594

JUDGE ANN ALDRICH

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

On January 8, 2010, Oneal Crenshaw (“Crenshaw”) filed a motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. In his motion, he argued that the Federal Bureau of Prisons erred in computing his credit for time served. Because Crenshaw contests the manner in which his sentence is being executed and not the legality of the sentence imposed, his challenge should have been brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and not pursuant to § 2255. *See United States v. Peterman*, 249 F.3d 458, 461 (6th Cir. 2001). A petition pursuant to § 2241 must be “directed to the person having custody of the person detained.” 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Crenshaw is currently housed in Adelanto, California, which is within the jurisdiction of the Central District of California. Because this court lacks personal jurisdiction over his custodian, Crenshaw’s petition is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Ann Aldrich
ANN ALDRICH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: January 29, 2010